

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 15, 17, 19 – 28 and 33 – 112 were pending in the case at the time of mailing the present Office Action. Claims 1 and 89 have been amended. Claims 35, 41, 43, 45, 59, 62, 64, 66, 68 and 71 have been cancelled. Claims depending on a cancelled Claim have been amended to depend on a non-cancelled Claim.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1 – 15, 17, 19 – 28 and 33 – 112 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,509 to Yeskel.

Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's counsel during a telephone interview on June 21, 2007. The substance of that interview is as follows:

- 1) The interview included a discussion of the rejection under 35 USC 103 no exhibits were shown and no demonstration was conducted.
- 2) Claim 1 was discussed.
- 3) No specific prior art was discussed, although general prior art disclosing the use of multiple data structures to store information and disclosing on-us items, all items and cash letter items was discussed.
- 4) Applicant's counsel and the Examiner discussed amendments to Claim 1 that would overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103.
- 5) See the additional Remarks/Arguments below.
- 6) No other pertinent matters were discussed.
- 7) Consistent with the interview, Applicant would file a Reply and Amendment.

Claims 1 and 89 have been amended to include the limitations that each of the multiple data structures includes a corresponding archive file that is stored offline, as opposed to online,

and a corresponding archive file index that is stored online, as opposed to offline. Storing the corresponding archive files offline, as opposed to online, reduces the amount of online storage required to store archived items and therefore reduces operating costs. Storing the corresponding archive file index online, as opposed to offline, increases the speed with which an archived item can be retrieved.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the rejections have been successfully overcome, and the application has been placed in condition for immediate allowance of Claims 1 – 15, 17, 19-28 and 33 – 34, 36 – 40, 42, 44, 46 – 58, 60 – 61, 63, 65, 67, 69 – 70 and 72 – 112. Such action is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains unresolved, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity for a telephone interview to expedite allowance and issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey R. McFadden
Registration No. 46,916
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0378
336-721-3730

Date: _____


File No.: W3688-025 (formerly S4770-103)

and a corresponding archive file index that is stored online, as opposed to offline. Storing the corresponding archive files offline, as opposed to online, reduces the amount of online storage required to store archived items and therefore reduces operating costs. Storing the corresponding archive file index online, as opposed to offline, increases the speed with which an archived item can be retrieved.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the rejections have been successfully overcome, and the application has been placed in condition for immediate allowance of Claims 1 – 15, 17, 19-28 and 33 – 34, 36 – 40, 42, 44, 46 – 58, 60 – 61, 63, 65, 67, 69 – 70 and 72 – 112. Such action is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains unresolved, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity for a telephone interview to expedite allowance and issue.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey R. McFadden
Registration No. 46,916
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0378
336-721-3730

Date: June 22, 2007
File No.: W3688-025 (formerly S4770-103)